

Nobuhiro ITOH, S.N. 10/054,147  
Page 6

Dkt. 2271/66652

REMARKS

The application has been reviewed in light of the final Office Action dated July 11, 2006. Claims 1-13 are pending and presented for reconsideration, with claims 1 and 5 being in independent form.

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,465,163 to Yoshihara et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,223,181 to Goldberg et al.

Applicant has carefully considered the Examiner's comments and the cited art, and respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 5 are patentable over the cited art, for at least the following reasons.

As already discussed of record, this application relates to reading and transmitting of a large-size copy (that is, having a width in a main scanning direction greater than an A3-size width) by a facsimile device. A conventional facsimile device (such as proposed in Yoshihara) would handle a large-size copy, such as shown in Fig. 2 of the present application, by requiring the operator to dividing the large-size copy into four sections (with overlap of adjacent sections) to be covered in four respective reading operations, each performed in the regular manner, that is, in the main scanning direction, and then the image data corresponding to the lines divided in the main scanning direction is transmitted.

In contrast, the claim provides for scanning the subject large-size copy (size larger than A3-size), then dividing lines of the image data in the subscanning direction, performing an image rotation so that the rotated image conforms with normal size requirements, encoding the rotated image data, and transmitted the encoded data. Such an approach allows the example of Fig. 2 of the present application to be transmitted as two pages (as opposed to four as required by the

Nobuhiro ITOH, S.N. 10/054,147  
Page 7

Dkt. 2271/66652

conventional approach such as proposed in Yoshihara). Each of independent claims 1 and 6 addresses these features, as well as additional features.

While the Office Action refers to Yoshihara, column 6, lines 14-25 which proposes reducing the four read images, the Examiner is respectfully requested to note that Yoshihara requires the user to specify through operation of an operation unit the number of read operations, and then for each read operation the user orients the original on the mount glass and presses the read key to trigger the read operation, and the read image portion is stored in memory (see Yoshihara, column 5, lines 35-54). Therefore, in the example discussed, the large-size copy is divided into four pages.

Yoshihara simply does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 1 of the present application, wherein the subject large-size copy is scanned and then lines of the image data are divided in the subscanning direction.

Goldberg, as understood by Applicant, proposes an image processing system having an image rotation function. The system proposed by Goldberg includes a small buffer memory with a storage capacity less than that required to store an entire image (of 8.5" by 11" sheet of paper). Goldberg proposes that the image is divided into image sections and each image section is rotated.

Goldberg does not address the issue of a large-sized document (that is, larger than A3-size).

Moreover, Goldberg, like Yoshihara, does not disclose or suggest that a large-size copy is scanned and then lines of the image data are divided in the subscanning direction, as provided by the subject matter of claim 1 of the present application.

Independent claim 5 is patentably distinct from the cited art for at least similar reasons.

Nobuhiro ITOH, S.N. 10/054,147  
Page 8

Dkt. 2271/66652


Accordingly, for at least the above-stated reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 5, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentable over the cited art.

In view of the remarks hereinabove, Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant earnestly solicits the allowance of the application.

If a petition for an extension of time is required to make this response timely, this paper should be considered to be such a petition. The Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required in connection with this Response and to credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul Teng, Reg. No. 40,837  
Attorney for Applicant  
Cooper & Dunham LLP  
Tel.: (212) 278-0400